



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Handwritten signature

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,386	12/08/2003	Kirk S. Goddard	MSFT-2785/302602.1	4645
41505 7590 02/21/2007 WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR 2929 ARCH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891			EXAMINER RIES, LAURIE ANNE	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	
3 MONTHS			02/21/2007	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/730,386

Applicant(s)

GODDARD ET AL.

Examiner

Laurie Ries

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed 16 November 2006, to the Original Application, filed 26 April 2004.
2. The rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
3. The rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Orr has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.
4. Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, 8, and 17 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 8-11, and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam (U.S. Patent 6,336,124 B1).

As per independent claim 1, Alam teaches a system to preserve formatting from an original file edited in a software development environment including a software development editor allowing a user to input an original text file having formatting characters (See Alam, Figure 5, and Column 6, lines 9-10).

Alam also teaches producing a first modified text file having automatic formatting (See Alam, Column 6, lines 16-22).

Alam also teaches accepting user changes to the first modified text file (See Alam, Column 1, lines 41-50).

Alam also teaches producing a second modified text file having automatic formatting character modifications and user edits (See Alam, Column 6, lines 50-65).

Alam also teaches comparing the first modified text file with the second modified text file to find a modified block of text and applying the modified block of text to the original file to create a final file (See Alam, Column 8, lines 15-36).

While Alam does not teach expressly preserving the original formatting characters in the final file, Alam does teach that formatting such as characters and fonts are transferred to the intermediate format, or second modified file, for inclusion in the outputted document, or final file (See Alam, Column 6, lines 50-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to conclude that the original formatting included in the intermediate, or second modified file, of Alam for inclusion in the output document, or final file, preserves the original formatting

Art Unit: 2176

characters in the final file, providing the benefit of allowing a user to view certain information in the same manner as originally intended by the author, such as including bolding certain words or phrases so as to draw the reader's attention to the word or phrase.

As per dependent claim 2, Alam teaches the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Alam also teaches that the final file includes source code (See Alam, Column 6, lines 24-26).

As per dependent claim 3, Alam teaches the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Alam also teaches that the final file includes HTML (See Alam, Column 6, lines 26-28).

As per independent claims 8 and 17, and dependent claims 9-11, Alam teaches a method to preserve formatting from an original file edited in a software development environment including receiving an unmodified file associated with a first character formatting having the formatting of the original file (See Alam, Column 6, lines 9-10).

Alam also teaches receiving a modified file associated with a second character formatting made automatically by a software development system editor (See Alam, Column 6, lines 50-65).

Alam also teaches comparing the first modified text file with the second modified text file to find a modified block of text and applying the modified block of text to the original file to create a final file (See Alam, Column 8, lines 15-36).

Alam also teaches that the unmodified file, the modified file and the final file may be HTML files (See Alam, Column 5, lines 28-31, and Column 6, lines 26-28).

While Alam does not teach expressly preserving the original formatting characters in the final file, Alam does teach that formatting such as characters and fonts are transferred to the intermediate format, or second modified file, for inclusion in the outputted document, or final file (See Alam, Column 6, lines 50-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to conclude that the original formatting included in the intermediate, or second modified file, of Alam for inclusion in the output document, or final file, preserves the original formatting characters in the final file, providing the benefit of allowing a user to view certain information in the same manner as originally intended by the author, such as including bolding certain words or phrases so as to draw the reader's attention to the word or phrase.

As per dependent claims 14-16 and 18-20, Alam teaches the limitations of claims 8 and 17 as described above. Alam also teaches comparing the unmodified and modified files by mapping blocks from the unmodified file to the modified file, determining whether a block in the modified file has a corresponding block in the unmodified file, and if not, inserting the block into the unmodified file or moving blocks to specific locations in the unmodified file, or deleting blocks in the final file (See Alam, Column 8, lines 15-36).

Art Unit: 2176

6. Claims 4-7 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam (U.S. Patent 6,336,124 B1) in view of Estrada (U.S. Patent 6,996,780 B2).

As per dependent claims 4-5 and 13, Alam teaches the limitations of claims 1 and 8 as described above. While Alam teaches a software development editor, Alam does not teach expressly a design mode module. Estrada teaches a software development editor that includes a design mode module (See Estrada, Column 15, lines 25-65). Alam and Estrada are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of editing software. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the design mode module of Estrada with the software development editor of Alam. The motivation for doing so would have been to view all fields contained within the original document, allowing the user to determine the formatting features of the original document (See Estrada, Column 15, lines 48-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Estrada with Alam for the benefit of viewing all fields contained within the original document, allowing the user to determine the formatting features of the original document, to obtain the invention as specified in claims 4-5 and 13.

As per dependent claims 6-7 and 12, Alam teaches the limitations of claims 1 and 8 as described above. While Alam teaches a software development editor, Alam does not teach expressly a source mode module. Estrada teaches a source mode module that allows a user to view the source code of a markup language document (See Estrada, Column 28, lines 64-67, and Column 29, lines 1-6). Alam and Estrada are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of editing software.

Art Unit: 2176

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the source mode module of Estrada with the software development editor of Alam. The motivation for doing so would have been to modify the markup language document by viewing and manipulating the document tags directly rather than by editing the image displayed on a browser-type display. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Estrada with Alam for the benefit of modifying the markup language document by viewing and manipulating the document tags directly, rather than by editing the image displayed on a browser-type display, to obtain the invention as specified in claims 6-7 and 12.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Kunitake (U.S. Publication 2001/0018697 A1) discloses a structured document processing system and method.

- Li (U.S. Patent 5,884,097) discloses a method for defining and using attribute data blocks to instantiate objects and describe changes to objects.
- Khandekar (U.S. Patent 6,732,102 B1) discloses an automated data extraction and reformatting method.
- Stonebraker discloses content integration for e-business.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095.

Art Unit: 2176

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER